

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing amendments to the application is requested on the grounds that the claims, as amended, patentably distinguish over the cited art of record or, alternatively, place the application in better condition for appeal. The claims more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 3, 4, 21, 28 and 33 have been amended. No new issues have been added which would require further consideration and/or search, nor has any new matter been added. The claims as amended are believed to avoid the rejections applied in the Final Office Action for reasons set forth more fully below.

The Final Office Action of October 18, 2007 has been received and carefully reviewed. It is submitted that, by this Amendment, all bases of rejection are traversed and overcome. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 3, 4, 6, 21-26 and 28-33 remain in the application. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 21, 22, 24-26 and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Schleicher et al. Furthermore, claims 3, 4, 6, 21-26 and 28-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuchida et al. in view of Schleicher et al.

Applicants' invention as recited in claim 3 relates to a print medium having increased resistance to gas fade. Specifically, it relates to a melt-coated inhibitor including an odorless sulfur-containing polymer melted at above 285°C to coat the print medium. Support for this recitation may be found in the specification as filed, e.g. at page 10, lines 12-14. The inhibitor has a molecular weight greater than approximately 1000. Specifically, the inhibitor includes poly(1,4-phenylene sulfide) or poly(1,3-phenylene sulfide). Furthermore, the print medium is a plain paper, a porous print medium, or a swellable print medium.

In contrast, Schleicher teaches using ozone-binding polymers to remove ozone from gases while combining it with activated carbon which removes organic substances. Both the ozone-binding polymers and activated carbon are used in a filter. To prepare the filter, the ozone-binding polymers can be used as powder, granules, fiber, fabric, felt, film, sintered material, foam or coatings on materials. Sulfur-containing compounds such as poly(phenylene sulfide) or poly(2,6-dimethylphenylene oxide) can also be applied as solutions and coated onto

or soaked onto generally inorganic materials such as glass, silica gel, alumina, sand, ceramic masses, metal and organic substances such as plastics.

Nothing in Schleicher teaches the element of a melt-coated ozone inhibitor on a print medium. On this basis alone, the §102(b) rejection should be withdrawn, as each and every element as set forth in the claim must be found either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference.

In the §103(a) rejection, the Examiner combines Schleicher with Tsuchida. Tsuchida teaches an inkjet recording medium comprising a homopolymer or copolymer compound containing sulfur. In order to be applied to the medium, the homopolymer or copolymer compounds are dissolved or dispersed in an aqueous solution. Nothing in either Tsuchida alone or in combination with Schleicher would make obvious or suggest to one skilled in the art Applicants' invention as recited in claims 3, 4, 21, 28 and 33. Specifically, nothing is taught or suggested in either reference about using polyphenylene sulfide as a coating for a print media. Tsuchida teaches using anti-ozone compounds which can be dispersed or dissolved in aqueous solutions, and which can then be applied to the media in that form. Schleicher teaches using polyphenylene sulfide as a coating of inorganic materials on a filter, but teaches using it either in solid form or in solution with an organic solvent. Schleicher does not teach using polyphenylene sulfide as a melt coat that can be applied after heating the polyphenylene sulfide to above its melting point.

For the above reasons, it is submitted that the combination of Schleicher and Tsuchida does not suggest or make obvious Applicants' invention as recited in the pending claims.

For all the reasons stated above, it is submitted that Applicants' invention as defined in independent claims 3, 4, 21, 28 and 33, as well as in those claims depending therefrom, is not anticipated, taught or rendered obvious over the cited references, and patentably defines over the art of record.

In summary, claims 3, 4, 6, 8-26 and 28-33 remain in the application. It is submitted that, through this Amendment, Applicants' invention as set forth in these claims is now in a condition suitable for allowance. Should the Examiner believe otherwise, it is submitted that the claims as amended qualify for entry as placing the application in better form for appeal.

Further and favorable consideration is requested. If the Examiner believes it would expedite prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicants' Attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

DIERKER & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

/Julia Church Dierker/

Julia Church Dierker
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33368
(248) 649-9900, ext. 25
juliad@troypatent.com

3331 West Big Beaver Rd., Suite 109
Troy, Michigan 48084-2813
Dated: December 18, 2007
JCD/WBH